

REMARKS

Review and reconsideration of the Office Action of July 22, 2004 is respectfully requested.

Paragraph 1

The Examiner indicates that PTO-1449 as well as the Japanese reference have not been received.

Applicants originally filed the (supplemental) IDS on October 14, 2003, and, in response to the Examiner's subsequent telephonic request, fax filed the (supplemental) IDS on July 20, 2004. Applicants attach hereto a copy of the IDS as originally filed October 14, 2003.

Paragraph 2

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is a lack of antecedent basis in the specification for the claimed feature.

Applicants amend paragraph [00037] of the specification to provide antecedent basis.

Paragraphs 3 and 4

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-14 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as obvious over Claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,629,556.

Applicants file herewith a terminal disclaimer.